

**Amendments to the Drawings:**

The attached sheet of drawing includes a change to Fig. 8, which have been marked as being “Prior Art”. This sheet replaces the original sheet including Fig. 8.

Attachment: Replacement Sheets.

#### REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

The Applicants would like to thank the Examiner for the careful consideration given the present application. The application has been carefully reviewed in light of the Office action, and amended as necessary to more clearly and particularly describe the subject matter in this application.

The Examiner requests the Applicants to provide Japanese references JP50-26344 and JP59-77578 that were cited in the PTO-1449 filed on February 21, 2006. Enclosed herewith are the Japanese Utility Patent Application Publications and a new IDS form citing the two references.

Fig. 8 is objected to as being prior art but not being so labeled. The proposed drawing amendment has been submitted as requested by the Examiner.

The Examiner requests to correct abstract for using the proper language. The abstract has been herewith amended as requested by the Examiner.

The disclosure is objected to because of the informalities. Paragraph [0005], [0016] and [0029] have been amended and paragraph [0035] has been deleted as requested by the Examiner.

Claims 11-13 are objected to because of the informalities. Claims 12-13 have been amended as requested by the Examiner. Claim 11 has been canceled and the limitations have been incorporated to claim 1. The incorporated limitation is corrected as requested by the Examiner.

Claims 1-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph. Claims 1-4, and 6-10 and 12-19 have been amended as requested by the Examiner.

With regard to claims 5 and 10, "outer peripheral portion thereof defining the cavity portion" is recited in claim 1, therefore referring to "the outer peripheral portion thereof defining the cavity portion" in claims 5 and 10 is not unclear, and claims 5 and 10 are not indefinite.

Claims 5 and 10 have been amended to clarify the language.

With regard to claim 11, claim 11 has been canceled and the limitations have been incorporated to claim 1. Claim 1 including the limitations from claim 11 has been amended to clarify the language. The “box body” is, for example, reference number “2” in Figs. 6 and 7, the “heat radiating unit” is, for example, reference number “1” in Figs. 1, 2, 6 and 7 and the “cavity portions” are, for example, reference number “3” in Figs. 2 and 4. Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-10 and 16-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Sigl (U.S. Patent No. 5,642,260). Claims 1-10 are also rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Schneider (U.S. Patent No. 6,888,099). Claim 1 has been amended to include limitations from claim 11, thereby rendering the rejection moot. Specifically, as the Examiner concedes in the Office action, neither Sigl nor Schneider discloses that a heat radiating unit includes two or more rows of cavity portions. Because Sigl and Schneider do not disclose each and every limitation set forth in amended claim 1, Sigl and Schneider do not anticipate amended claim 1.

Claims 2-10 and 16-19 depend directly or indirectly on claim 1, and thus are patentable for at least the same reasons as the parent claim.

Claims 11-15 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 (a) over Sigl or Schneider in view of Shimada. (Japanese Patent Application Publication No. H08-99182). For at least the following reasons, the Examiner's rejection is respectfully traversed. The asserted combination of Sigl or Schneider and Shimada, independently or in combination, does not teach or suggest all features of the claimed invention.

As mentioned above, claim 11 has been canceled and the limitations have been incorporated to claim 1. As the Examiner concedes, neither Sigl nor Schneider teaches or suggests that a heat radiating unit includes two or more rows of cavity portions. The Examiner

asserts that Shimada discloses an inverter-type welding power source unit . . . a box body 72 divided into two rows of cavity portions. Applicants respectfully disagree. Shimada's 72 is a collar through which a control board 36 is arranged on an upper board 20c. Shimada does not teach or suggest that the Shimada's unit main body 20 is divided to two or more rows. Therefore, Shimada fails to make up for the aforementioned Sigl and Schneider's deficiencies. Thus, the asserted combination of Sigl or Schneider and Shimada does not teach or suggest each and every feature of the claimed intention. That is, the asserted combination of Sigl or Schneider and Shimada fails to teach or suggest all features of the claims. Consequently, the asserted combination of Sigl or Schneider and Shimada does not render claim 1 obvious. Claims 12-15 depend directly or indirectly on claim 1, and thus are patentable for at least the same reasons as the parent claim.

In light of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that the present application is in a condition for allowance and notice to that effect is hereby requested. If it is determined that the application is not in a condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to initiate a telephone interview with the undersigned agent to expedite prosecution of the present application.

If there are any additional fees resulting from this communication, please charge same to our Deposit Account No. 16-0820, our Order No.39712.

Respectfully submitted,

PEARNE & GORDON LLP

Date: May 31, 2007

By: /michaelwgarvey/  
Michael W. Garvey, Reg. No. 35878

1801 East 9th Street  
Suite 1200  
Cleveland, Ohio 44114-3108  
(216) 579-1700